Interview Summary	Application No. 09/753,508	Applicant(s) Anderson et al.
	Examiner Gina Yu	Group Art Unit 1619
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):	<u> </u>
(1) Gina Yu	(3) Diana <u>Duda</u>	sh
(2) Charles Ruggiero		
Date of Interview Oct 24, 2001		
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant	2)⊠ applicant's re	presentative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes	e) 🖾 No. If yes, b	ief description:
Claim(s) discussed: All pending.		
Identification of prior art discussed: Rouquet and Ishida		·
Claims 3-5 should be changed to independent claims to avoid conflict with claim 1. Rouquet does not meet the particle size limitation, as the reference requires particle size less than 10 microns. Ishida lacks elastomer particles, but claims don't require the particle size distribution of elastomer. Sec. 112 rejection on "substantially" are to be withdrawn. Examiner urges to change the term "vehicle" in claim 17 to "form." The claims overall appear to be allowable over the prior art of record, upon clarification of sec. 112 issues, pending further search.		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE		
SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Reco	rd.of Interview requir	